

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

### Summary of the Office Action

Claims 1-9, 11, and 13-18 are pending.

Claims 1, 9, 11, 16, 17, and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Rynderman U.S. Patent No. 5,563,961 (hereinafter "Rynderman").

Claims 2-8 and 13-15 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

### Summary of Applicants' Amendments

Applicants have amended claims 2-3, 5-8, and 13-15 to be in independent form.

Applicants have amended claims 1, 9, 11, 16, 17, and 18 solely in order to expedite prosecution.

Applicants have added new claims 19-27 in order to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that applicants regard as the invention.

The Examiner's rejections are respectfully traversed. Applicants reserve the right to pursue subject matter lost by any of the amendments in a continuation or divisional application.

Applicant's Reply to the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejections

Claims 1, 9, 11, 16, 17, and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Rynderman.

Rynderman allegedly discusses a codec circuit with rate control. The system of Rynderman performs tests to determine what the overall attainable bandwidth for data transfers to and from the disk is likely to be and then sets the compression rate control of the codec to an optimal value which does not exceed this amount.

Claims 1 and 16

The Examiner stated that Rynderman shows two compression routines (See Office Action, pages 2 and 3).

Applicants inventions of claims 1 and 16 utilizes a first compression routine including a first compression algorithm and a second compression routine including a second compression algorithm.

Rynderman does not show or suggest utilizing two or more compression algorithms. Rynderman discusses a single codec where the rate of the circuit can be changed.

For at least the above reasons, applicants respectfully request that the Examiner's rejection of claims 1 and 16, and any claims dependent therefrom, under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) be withdrawn.

#### Claims 9 and 17

The Examiner stated that Rynderman shows two compression routines (See Office Action, pages 2 and 3).

Applicants inventions of claims 9 and 17 utilize a first compression routine including a first compression algorithm and a second compression routine including a second compression algorithm.

Rynderman does not show or suggest utilizing two or more compression algorithms. Rynderman discusses a single codec where the rate of the circuit can be changed.

Futhermore, Rynderman does not show or suggest compressing a digital data stream at a compression rate that increases the effective data storage rate of a target storage device.

For at least the above reasons, applicants respectfully request that the Examiner's rejection of claims 9 and 17, and any claims dependent therefrom, under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) be withdrawn.

#### Claim 11

The Examiner stated that Rynderman shows two compression routines (See Office Action, pages 2 and 3).

Applicants inventions of claim 11 utilizes a plurality of compression routines selectively utilized by the data

compression system. A first one of the plurality of compression routines includes a first compression algorithm and a second one of the plurality of compression routines includes a second compression algorithm.

Rynderman does not show or suggest utilizing two or more compression algorithms. Rynderman discusses a single codec where the rate of the circuit can be changed.

For at least the above reasons, applicants respectfully request that the Examiner's rejection of claims 1 and 16, and any claims dependent therefrom, under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) be withdrawn.

#### Claim 18

The Examiner stated that Rynderman shows two compression routines (See Office Action, pages 2 and 3).

Applicants invention of claim 18 utilizes a first compression algorithm and a second compression algorithm.

Rynderman does not show or suggest utilizing two or more compression algorithms. Rynderman discusses a single codec where the rate of the circuit can be changed.

For at least the above reasons, applicants respectfully request that the Examiner's rejection of claim 18, and any claims dependent therefrom, under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) be withdrawn.

#### Applicant's Reply to the Claim Objections

The Examiner objected to claims 2-8 and 13-15 for depending from a rejected base claim. The Examiner stated the claims would be in condition for allowance if placed in independent form.

Applicants have amended claims 2-3, 5-8, and 13-15 to be in independent form. Claim 4 depends from patentable independent claim 3.

Applicants have amended the preambles of the claims and associated elements. Applicants respectfully submit that amended claims 2-8 and 13-15 are patentable.

In light of the foregoing, applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner's objections be withdrawn.

#### New Claims 19-27

Applicants have added new claims 9-26. These claims depend from patentable independent claims. Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that claims 9-26 are patentable.

Applicants have added new claim 27, which includes patentable features included in claim 9. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 27 is patentable for at least a reason that claim 9 is patentable.

Conclusion

The Director is hereby authorized to charge any fees due, or credit any overpayment of the same, in conjunction with this filing to Deposit Account No. 06-1075.

In light of the foregoing, applicant respectfully submits that this application, including the pending claims, is in condition for allowance. A favorable action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jeffrey D. Mullen/  
Jeffrey D. Mullen  
(Reg. No. 52,056)  
Agent for Applicants  
[X] Submitted under 37 C.F.R. § 1.34  
Fish & Neave IP Group  
Ropes & Gray LLP  
Customer No. 1473  
1211 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, NY 10036  
(212) 596-9000